

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE J	PAGE OF PAGES 1 19
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0003	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 15-Aug-2016	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. F2F3236175AW02-0001		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable) FTEV 16-1066
6. ISSUED BY 1 SOCONS 350 TULLY ST. HURLBURT FIELD FL 32544	CODE FA4417	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) See Item 6		
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)		X	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. FA4417-16-R-0025	
		X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 29-Jul-2016	
			10A. MOD. OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
			10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE	FACILITY CODE			
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offer <input type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offer must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.				
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)				
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.				
A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.				
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).				
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:				
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)				
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.				
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.) The purpose of this amendment is to change the recency criteria from five (5) years to six (6) years. 1. In section L Paragraph 3.1.1.1 (a) recency has been changed from five to six years. 2. In section M Paragraph c (1) (i) recency has been changed from five to six years.				
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.				
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)		
		TEL: _____ EMAIL: _____		
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR _____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)	16C. DATE SIGNED 16-Aug-2016	

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

SECTION L - INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS AND NOTICES TO BIDDERS

The following have been modified:

Section L - Instructions, Conditions, and Notices to Offerors

SECTION L

INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS OR RESPONDENTS

1.0 General Instructions

1.0.1. The offeror's proposal must include all data and information requested by this Instructions to Offerors (ITO) and must be submitted in accordance with these instructions. The offer shall be compliant with the requirements as stated in the attached Specifications and this Solicitation.

Non-conformance with the instructions provided in this ITO may result in an unfavorable proposal evaluation.

1.0.2. The proposal shall be clear, concise, and shall include sufficient detail for effective evaluation and for substantiating the validity of stated claims. The proposal should not simply rephrase or restate the Government's requirements but rather provide convincing rationale to address how the offeror intends to meet these requirements. Offerors shall assume that the Government has no prior knowledge of their facilities and experience and may rely heavily, during its evaluation on the information presented in the offeror's proposal.

1.0.3. Elaborate brochures or documentation, binding, detailed art work, or other embellishments are unnecessary and are not desired.

1.0.4. The proposal acceptance period is specified in Section A of solicitation. The offeror shall make a clear statement in Section A of the proposal documentation volume that the proposal is valid through this date.

1.0.5. In accordance with FAR Subpart 4.8 (Government Contract Files), the Government will retain one copy of all unsuccessful proposals.

1.0.6. The Contracting Officer has determined there is a high probability of adequate price competition in this acquisition. Upon examination of the initial offers, the Contracting Officer will review this determination and if, in the contracting officer's opinion, adequate price competition exists no additional cost information will be requested and certification under FAR 15.406-2 will not be required. However, if at any time during this competition the contracting

officer determines that adequate price competition no longer exists; offerors may be required to submit information to the extent necessary for the contracting officer to determine the reasonableness and affordability of the price.

1.1 General Information

1.1.1. Point of Contact

The Contracting Officer (CO) is the sole point of contact (POC) for this acquisition. Address any questions or concerns you may have to the CO. Written requests for clarification may be sent to the CO at the following email addresses:

Robert Burns, Contracting Officer, Robert.Burns.40@us.af.mil, 850-884-2036

1.1.2. Debriefings

The CO will promptly notify offerors of any decision to exclude them from the competitive range; whereupon, they may request and receive a debriefing in accordance with [FAR 15.505](#). Offerors excluded from the competitive range may request a preaward debriefing or they may choose to wait until after the source selection decision to request a post award debriefing. However, offerors excluded from the competitive range are entitled to no more than one debriefing for each proposal. The CO will notify unsuccessful offerors in the competitive range of the source selection decision in accordance with [FAR 15.506](#). Upon such notification, unsuccessful offerors may request a debriefing. Offerors desiring a debriefing must make their request in accordance with the requirements of FAR 15.505 or 15.506, as applicable.

1.1.3. Discrepancies

If an offeror believes that the requirements in these instructions contain an error, omission, or are otherwise unsound, the offeror shall immediately notify the CO in writing with supporting rationale as well as the remedies the offeror is asking the CO to consider as related to the omission or error. The offeror is reminded that the Government reserves the right to award this effort based on the initial proposal, as received, without discussion. This reservation includes matters of additional or substitute pages of the initial proposal.

1.1.4. Electronic Reference Documents

All referenced documents for this solicitation are available on the Federal Business Opportunities (FedBizOpps) website at <http://www.fedbizopps.gov>. Potential offerors are encouraged to subscribe for real-time e-mail notifications when information has been posted to the website for this solicitation.

1.1.5 Who Can Participate

Who Can Participate. Proposals may only be submitted by Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business firms. At the time of initial contract offer and at time of award, each business must be a SDVOSB. In order to submit an offer on a contract, each business concern in a teaming agreement must be a small business under the designated NAICS size standard, and must also be small when combined in the aggregate of all teaming affiliates.

1.2 Organization/Number of Copies/Page Limits

Proposals shall be prepared in three volumes: **Volume I – Technical Proposal –SUBFACTOR 1 and SUBFACTOR 2, Volume II – Past Performance Information, and Volume III – Price Proposal** – Volumes I through III constitute the proposal. Specific guidance regarding the content of each volume will be discussed further below. Page limitations shall be treated as maximums. If exceeded, the excess pages will not be read or considered in the evaluation of the proposal. Page limitations may be placed on responses to Evaluation Notices (ENs) as well. The specified page limits for EN responses will be identified in the letters forwarding the ENs to the offerors

1.2.1.1. Page Size, Format and Limit

(a) A page is defined as each face of a sheet of paper containing information. When both sides of a sheet display printed material, it shall be counted as two pages. Pages in excess of the maximum will be removed from the proposal and will not be evaluated. For the purposes of formatting, a page is defined as one face of an 8 ½” X 11” sheet of paper containing information and typing shall not be less than 12 pitch. Pages shall be numbered sequentially by volume. The stated page and format restrictions shall apply to responses to ENs; as well as, the stated limitations shall apply to both electronic and hard copy proposals.

(b) Volume I – Technical Proposal –SUBFACTOR 1 - Page Limit	15
SUBFACTOR 2 - Page Limit	5
Volume II (a) – Past Performance Information - Page Limit	20
Volume II (b) – Teaming Agreement Information - Page Limit	10
Volume III – Cost/Price - Page Limit	15

1.2.2 Cost or Pricing Related Data

All cost or pricing data shall be addressed **ONLY** in the Cost/Price Proposal and Contract Documentation Volumes. Cost trade off information, work hour estimates, and material kinds and quantities may be used in other volumes only as appropriate for presenting rationale for alternatives or design and trade off decisions.

1.2.3 Cross-Referencing

To the greatest extent possible, each volume shall be written on a stand-alone basis so that its contents may be evaluated with a minimum of cross referencing to other volumes of the proposal. Information required for proposal evaluation which is not found in its designated volume will be assumed to have been omitted from the proposal. Cross-referencing within a proposal volume is permitted where its use would conserve space without impairing clarity.

1.2.4 Indexing

Each volume shall contain a more detailed table of contents to delineate the subparagraphs within that volume. Tab indexing shall be used to identify sections. Indexing is not included in the page limitations.

1.3 Electronic Offers

Electronic offers will not be accepted.

1.4 Distribution

The "original" proposal shall be identified. Proposals shall be addressed to the CO and mailed or hand carried to:

1 SOCONS
Attention: Robert Burns
Building 90339
350 Tully St
Hurlburt Field, FL 32544

1.5 Proposal Acceptance Period

The proposal acceptance period is specified in Block 13d of the Standard Form 1442 of the Solicitation. In the accordance with Block 17, the number inserted must be equal to or greater than the number of days listed in Block 13d.

2.0 FACTOR 1, VOLUME I - Technical Volume

(Submit original and one (1) sanitized copy with CAGE code only in place of Company Name). Sanitized copy shall be provided in a separate binder. Entire volume is limited to 20 pages.

2.1 General:

The technical proposal shall be prepared in accordance with these instructions and shall be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation criteria and evaluation standards in Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award. Technical proposals shall include necessary information to enable the evaluators to form a definitive conclusion concerning the offeror's ability to perform the required construction and design-build services.

2.1.1 SUBFACTOR 1 – Progress Schedule

Using the provided specifications, the offeror must provide a project schedule and narrative supporting the schedule. The proposal shall describe procedures, processes and methods for tracking the progress of the project and interface with the Government and contractor team from beginning to end. At a minimum, the Contract Progress Schedule must include mobilization, submittals, demolition, major work elements by specification division, final inspection, demobilization, and close-out documents. The schedule must be in the form of a progress chart of suitable scale to indicate appropriately the percentage of work scheduled for completion by any given date during the performance period. The submitted schedule must be developed using project scheduling software such as MS Project, Primavera, or any other comparable form. The AF Form 3064 (Contract Progress Schedule) may also be used for submission of this item. Offerors should only include the work elements necessary to complete the required work. This list is provided as a guide and is not all inclusive or exclusive. It is the offeror's responsibility to identify all necessary work elements. The form must show major measurable line items of the construction project, percentage/value each line item represents in the total proposal cost and a timeline when each line item is scheduled to be completed. The progress schedule shall address the following elements:

2.1.1.1 Identification of separate work elements

2.1.1.2 Order of work elements to include project phasing

2.1.1.3 Number of days for each work element

2.1.1.4 Identification of Long Lead Time Materials (Long lead items such as major HVAC equipment, electrical equipment, pre-engineered buildings, etc. must be specifically identified in the technical proposal. **If there are no Long Lead Time Materials, the proposal must state that there are no Long Lead Time Materials).**

2.1.2 SUBFACTOR 2 – Architect and Engineer (A/E) Team

A&E: The contractor shall identify whom they plan to use as the A&E firm for the contract. The designer of record is required to be a professional architect/engineer and the team must be comprised of registered architectural and engineering personnel with experience in the disciplines required to make a complete and usable project. The offeror must identify each member of the team and their engineering discipline required to make a complete and usable project. The offeror must submit evidence showing the credentials of the architect and engineering team, proving the requirement above has been met.

3.0 FACTOR 2, Volume II - PAST PERFORMANCE Submit original and one (1) copy. Volume II(a) is limited to 20 pages and Volume II(b) is limited to 10 pages. Past Performance Questionnaires and Construction Contractor's Appraisal Support System (CCASS) evaluations are not included in the page limitation.

3.1 Offerors shall provide adequate past performance information on completed or current contracts (including Federal, State, local government and private) considered most relevant in demonstrating the ability to perform the proposed work as identified within the Specifications. Offerors must provide past performance information to establish Recency and Relevancy on all Federal contracts before State, local government or private contracts. The Government's evaluation of past performance information will take into account past performance information regarding predecessor companies, key personnel who have relevant experience, or subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects (See Teaming Agreements, para 3.1.8, when such information is relevant to the instant acquisition. Offerors are required to explain what aspects of each contract are deemed relevant to complexity and magnitude as related to the requirements of this solicitation and in accordance with Section M. Failure to provide required relevancy description may impact the confidence rating, (i.e. aspects of previous projects should match work elements identified in the Solicitation/specification).

3.1.1 Provide a summary of the previous contracts described above, not to exceed 1 page of past performance information per reference. The summary should explain what aspects of each contract are deemed recent and relevant as related to the requirements of this solicitation and in

accordance with Section M. Failure to provide required relevancy description may impact the confidence rating, (i.e. aspects of previous projects should match work elements identified in the solicitation/specification). The summary should not exceed 1 page per reference (maximum total of 10 pages) and include:

- a) Name of project (Contract number, if applicable)
- b) Name and address of customer or Government agency
- c) Name, telephone, fax number and/or email of customer contact or contracting officer
- d) Dollar value
- e) Period of performance/Completion date
- f) Brief description of work performed, and why the effort is relevant
- g) Comments regarding any known performance deemed unacceptable to the customer, or not in accordance with the contract terms and conditions

3.1.1.1 Each proposal shall provide current and relevant information regarding an offeror's actions under previously awarded contracts

a) Recency Assessment

An assessment of the past performance information will be made to determine if it is recent. To be recent, the effort must be ongoing or must have been performed during the past six (6) years from the issuance month of this solicitation. Past performance information that fails this condition will not be evaluated.

b) Relevancy Assessment

The Government will conduct an in-depth evaluation of all recent performance information obtained to determine how closely the products provided/services performed under those contracts relate to the Technical subfactors and Cost/Price factor, including their relative order of importance (reference 1.1a). Consideration will be given to projects involving the type of construction and work elements described in the attached Specifications. Relevant past performance information must demonstrate design and construction experience with facilities of equal or greater size as this project (2,270 square feet). Past performance must also demonstrate experience with ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC), electrical, mechanical, and other major trades required by this project. A relevancy determination of the offeror's past performance will be made based upon the aforementioned considerations, including joint venture partner(s). In determining relevancy for individual contracts, consideration will be given to the effort, or portion of the effort, being proposed by the offeror or teaming partner whose contract is being reviewed and evaluated. The past performance information forms (PIFs) and information obtained from other sources will be used to establish the degree of relevancy of past performance.

3.1.2 Offerors shall identify past contracts for efforts similar to the Government requirement as stated in this RFP. Offerors must provide information on all relevant Federal contracts before State, local government or private contracts. Limit contract references to work performed in the last five (5) years with a maximum of 10 total references. All references for work that have not been performed within five (5) years of the issue month of the solicitation will not be evaluated.

In addition, past performance information on contracts not listed by the offeror may be solicited and used in determining the overall past performance rating.

3.1.3 Provide a summary of the previous contracts described above, not to exceed 1 page of past performance information per reference. The summary must include:

- (1) Name of project (Contract number, if applicable)
- (2) Name and address of customer or Government agency
- (3) Name, telephone, fax number and/or email of customer contact or contracting officer
- (4) Dollar value
- (5) Period of performance/Completion date
- (6) Brief description of work performed, and why the effort is relevant

3.1.4 Complete Section A, Contractor Information, of Attachment 6, Past/Present Performance Questionnaire and mail, fax or email the attached Past/Present Performance Questionnaire to all past performance references in the list you provide and instruct them to return the completed questionnaire to the individual(s) indicated in paragraph 3.1.5 below. Evaluators are only allowed to use the Attachment 6, Past Performance Questionnaire. Altered or substituted questionnaires will not be evaluated. Also, Past Performance Questionnaires will only be accepted from Project Owners or their authorized representatives. Past Performance Questionnaires will not be accepted from Prime Contractors, Subcontractors, or Manufacturers. Offerors are responsible to ensure questionnaires are transmitted to their references, and to indicate which references the questionnaire was sent to (see paragraph 3.1.3 above).

3.1.5 Inform your references that they shall forward questionnaires directly to the address below. Questionnaires must be received in the 1st Special Operations Contracting Squadron office not later than the closing date of the solicitation. Offerors are responsible for ensuring their references transmit the questionnaire to the Contracting Office. In lieu of a Past/Present Performance Questionnaire, if a project is currently available in the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), the contractor should attach the evaluation to the questionnaire with the relevant solicitation number and submit directly to the 1st Special Operations Contracting Squadron office before the official closing date and time.

1 SOCONS/LGCB
Attention: Robert Burns or Michael Sgambati
350 Tully St, Bldg 90339
Hurlburt Field, FL 32544-5810
Fax: (850) 884-1272

OR Email: Robert Burns – Robert.Burns.40@us.af.mil
Michael Sgambati – Michael.Sgambati@us.af.mil

3.1.6 Lack of any past performance will not automatically disqualify an offeror, but it is a factor that is considered in the Best Value Subjective Tradeoff Source Selection described in Section M.

3.1.7 If the offeror claims there is no past performance, then that status must be identified to the contracting officer not later than the date/time proposals are due from all offerors.

3.1.8 Volume II(b) - If Teaming Agreements are contemplated they must comply with the appropriate Federal Regulations (13 C.F.R. Part 121 (Size Regulations), and Part 125 (Government Contracting Programs). The teaming members must provide complete information as to relevant and recent past performance information on previous teaming agreements. If this is a first time joint effort, each party to the teaming agreement must provide information on all relevant contracts as specified in paragraph (ii). The maximum number of references combined shall not exceed 15 total.

3.1.8.1 The Government will recognize the integrity and validity of formal contractor teaming agreements; provided, the agreements are identified and company relationships are fully disclosed in an offer. A teaming agreement must establish each party's role in the proposal preparation process and will be incorporated into the contract. Failure to clearly define roles and/or provide a teaming agreement with a proposal shall make teaming arrangements and related subcontractor past performance ineligible for evaluation and consideration of award. The prime contractor shall remain fully responsible for contract performance, regardless of any teaming agreement between the prime contractor and its subcontractors. **Teaming Agreements must provide the following information as part of their proposal, Volume II (b), not later than the date/time proposals are due:**

- (a) Clearly establish roles of each party (who is prime and who is subcontractor, who is responsible for what tasks, contract administration, proposals, work management, etc)
- (b) Provide for protection of competition-sensitive proprietary information. (subcontractor past performance cannot be disclosed to the prime offeror without the subcontractor's consent). Provide a letter from all subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement, consenting to the release of their past performance information to the prime contractor, only if it is being used as part of the past performance evaluation.
- (c) **Identify each member's share of the prospective contract, 50/50, 51/49, etc.**
- (d) Exclusivity. Assurance that the team member will not be replaced for the duration of the contract, any exceptions should be identified. Assurance that the team members are not teaming with another firm for the same procurement.
- (e) Statement of acknowledgement that the Prime Contractor is responsible for adhering to contract terms and conditions and daily management. The Prime Contractor is obligated to negotiate in good faith and responsible for conveying mandatory government terms and conditions to subcontractors.
- (f) The prime contractor shall remain fully responsible for contract performance, regardless of any teaming agreement between the prime contractor and its subcontractors.

3.1.8.2 At the time of initial contract offer and at time of award, each business must be a SDVOSB. In order to submit an offer on a contract, each business concern in a teaming agreement must be a small business under the designated NAICS size standard, and must also be small when combined in the aggregate of all teaming affiliates.

4.0 FACTOR 3, VOLUME III - Price/Cost Proposal. Submit the Standard Form 1442 and all pages originally included in the RFP. Submit original and one (1) copy.

4.1 Complete blocks 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, and 20a-c of the SF 1442, Solicitation, Offer, and Award. An authorized official of the firm submitting the offer must sign and date the SF 1442 in block 20a-c. (In doing so, the offeror accedes to the contract terms and conditions as written in the RFP, Sections A through K).

4.2 Insert prices in Section B for each Contract Line Items, including all options. All line items must be filled in. Failure to provide prices for all line items may eliminate you from competition.

4.3 Complete representations and certifications in Section K or the System for Award Management (SAM).

4.4 Submit the Financial Reference Worksheet (Attachment 5) with the top portion only completed

5.0 Relationship between Instructions and Evaluation.

Your attention is directed to the functional relationship between Sections L and M of this solicitation. Section L provides information for the purpose of organizing the proposal and is not intended to be all inclusive. Section M describes evaluation factors for award. Since the Government evaluation of proposals will cover areas identified in Section M, proposals should address all such areas of evaluation.

6.0 Amendment of Solicitation Prior to Closing.

The government reserves the right to revise or amend the specifications, drawings, or the solicitation prior to the proposal closing time. Such reservations or amendments will be communicated by amendments to the Request for Proposal (RFP) and posted on the Federal Business Opportunities website (www.FBO.gov). If such amendments require material changes in quantities or prices, the proposal closing date may be postponed by enough days to enable offerors to revise their proposals. In such cases, the amendment will include an announcement of the new closing date and time. Offerors **MUST** acknowledge all amendments in their proposal, either by completing SF 1442 Block 18, providing signed copies of the amendments with their proposal (Section III), or by separate letter which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers

7.0 Questions.

All questions regarding this solicitation must be submitted in writing. All questions received prior to RFP closing date and subsequent answers will be posted to the Federal Business

Opportunities website www.fbo.gov. It is the responsibility of the contractor to continuously monitor the site for updates. To mitigate the risks associated with the cancellation of this solicitation due to untimely submission of questions, all questions must be submitted to the individual(s) listed below no later than close of business 5 calendar days after the site visit. Any questions submitted after this period may not be answered.

FAX: 850-884-1272

Attention: Robert Burns or Michael Sgambati.

OR Email: Robert Burns – Robert.Burns.40@us.af.mil

Michael Sgambati – Michael.Sgambati@us.af.mil

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

The following have been modified:

Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award **SECTION M**

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

1.0 SOURCE SELECTION

a. Basis for Contract Award

This is a best value source selection conducted in accordance with [Federal Acquisition Regulation \(FAR\) 15.3](#), Source Selection, as supplemented by the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS), and the Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (AFFARS). These regulations are available electronically at the Air Force (AF) FARSite, <http://farsite.hill.af.mil>. The Best Value technique chosen for this particular acquisition will be a Subjective Tradeoff. The Government will select the best overall offer, based upon an integrated assessment of Technical/Technical Risk, Past Performance, and Cost/Price. Contract(s) may be awarded to the offeror who is deemed responsible in accordance with the FAR, as supplemented, whose proposal conforms to the solicitation's requirements (to include all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by Section L of this solicitation) and is judged, based on the evaluation factors and subfactors to represent the best value to the Government. The Government seeks to award to the offeror who gives the Air Force the greatest confidence that it will best meet, or exceed, the requirements. This may result in an award to a higher rated, higher priced offeror, where the decision is consistent with the evaluation factors, and the Source Selection Authority (SSA) reasonably determines that the technical and/or past performance of the higher price offeror outweighs the cost difference. The SSA will base the source selection decision on an integrated assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in the solicitation (described below). While the Government source selection evaluation team and the SSA will strive for maximum objectivity, the source selection process, by its nature, is subjective; and therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process.

b. Discussions.

If, during the evaluation period, it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to hold discussions, offeror responses to Evaluation Notices (ENs) and the Final Proposal Revision (FPR) will be considered in making the source selection decision. If the offeror's proposal has been evaluated as acceptable at the time discussions are closed, any changes or exceptions in the Final Proposal Revision are subject to evaluation and may introduce risk that the offeror's proposal be determined unacceptable and ineligible for award.

1.1 EVALUATION FACTORS

a. Evaluation Factors and Subfactors

(1) The following evaluation factors and subfactors will be used to evaluate each proposal: Award will be made to the offeror proposing the combination most advantageous to the Government based upon an integrated assessment of the evaluation factors and subfactors described below.

Factor 1: Technical

Subfactor 1: Project Schedule

Subfactor 2: Architect and Engineer Team

Factor 2: Past Performance

Factor 3: Cost/Price

(2) Relative Importance of Factors and Subfactors. The relative importance of each factor and subfactor is as follows: Technical, Past Performance and Cost/Price are listed in descending order of importance with Factor 1 (Technical) being most important, Factor 2 (Past Performance) next in importance and Factor 3 (Cost/Price) is last in importance. Within the Technical Factor, subfactor 1 is more important than subfactor 2.

In accordance with FAR 15.304(e), all evaluation factors other than Cost/Price, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price.

b. Technical Factor

The Technical evaluation provides for two distinct but related assessments into one rating: the Technical and the Technical Risk. These two have equal impact for the rating of each Technical subfactor.

(1) Technical Assessment. The technical assessment provides an assessment of the quality of the offeror's solution for meeting the Government's requirement. The assessment will focus on the strengths and deficiencies of the offeror's proposal, and how well the offeror's proposal meets the Technical subfactor requirements.

(2) Technical Risk Assessment. The Assessment of Technical Risk, which is manifested by the identification of weakness(es), considers potential for disruption of schedule, degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, or the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance. The risk rating considers the risk associated with the technical approach in meeting the requirement. For any weakness identified, the evaluation shall

address the offeror's proposed mitigation and why that mitigation approach is or is not manageable.

Each Technical subfactor will receive one of the color ratings described in [DoD](#) Source Selection Procedures, Table 3 – Combined Technical/Risk Ratings, excerpted below. The Technical Risk descriptions identified in the Combined Technical/Risk Rating description are further defined in [DoD](#) Source Selection Procedures, Table 2B – Technical Risk Descriptions, excerpted below. Subfactor ratings shall not be rolled up into an overall color rating for the Technical factor.

TABLE 3 – COMBINED TECHNICAL/RISK RATINGS		
Color Rating	Adjectival Rating	Description
Blue	Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Purple	Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate.
Green	Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Yellow	Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Red	Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation, and thus, contains one or more deficiencies, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is unacceptable. Proposal is unawardable.

TABLE 2B – TECHNICAL RISK DESCRIPTIONS	
Rating	Description
Low	Proposal may contain weakness(es) which have little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.
Moderate	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which may potentially cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will likely be able to

	overcome difficulties.
High	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which is likely to cause significant disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Is unlikely to overcome any difficulties, even with special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring.
Unacceptable	Proposal contains a material failure or a combination of significant weaknesses that increases the risk of unsuccessful performance to an unacceptable level.

Subfactor 1: Project Schedule: Using the provided specifications, the offeror must provide a project schedule and narrative supporting the schedule. The proposal shall describe procedures, processes and methods for tracking the progress of the project and interface with the Government and contractor team from beginning to end. Please refer to section L para. 2.1.1 for details regarding progress schedule format requirements. The progress schedule and supporting narrative will be evaluated on how well the offeror captured the separate work elements of the project, the order of work elements to include project phasing, number of days for each work element, and the identification of long lead time materials. Long lead items such as major HVAC equipment, electrical equipment, pre-engineered buildings, etc., must be specifically identified in the technical proposal. If there are no Long Lead Time Materials, the proposal must state that there are no Long Lead Time Materials. At a minimum, the Contract Progress Schedule must include mobilization, submittals, demolition, major work elements by specification division, final inspection, demobilization, and close-out documents. The schedule must be in the form of a progress chart of suitable scale to indicate appropriately the percentage of work scheduled for completion by any given date during the performance period.

Subfactor 2: Architect and Engineer (A/E) Team

The contractor shall identify whom they plan to use as the A&E firm for the contract. The designer of record is required to be a professional architect/engineer and the team must be comprised of registered architectural and engineering personnel with experience in the disciplines required to make a complete and usable project. The offeror must identify each member of the team and their engineering discipline required to make a complete and usable project. Please see Section L para. 2.1.2 for further instructions on this subfactor.

c. Past Performance Factor

The Past Performance evaluation will result in an overall performance confidence assessment as defined below. This performance confidence assessment represents the Government evaluation team's judgment of the probability of an offeror successfully accomplishing the proposed effort based on the offeror's demonstrated past and present performance. The performance confidence assessments are defined as follows:

TABLE 5- PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENTS	
Rating	Description
SUBSTANTIAL CONFIDENCE	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
SATISFACTORY CONFIDENCE	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
UNKNOWN CONFIDENCE (NEUTRAL)	No recent/relevant performance record is available or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned. The offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the factor of past performance.
LIMITED CONFIDENCE	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
NO CONFIDENCE	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

(1) Evaluation Process. The past performance evaluation considers each offeror's demonstrated recent and relevant record of performance in supplying products and services that meet the contract's requirements. Performance confidence is assessed at the overall Past Performance factor level after evaluating aspects of the offeror's recent past performance, focusing on performance that is relevant to the Technical subfactors and Cost/Price factor taking into consideration their relative order of importance stated in 1.1a. In conducting the Past Performance evaluation, the Government reserves the right to use both the information provided in the offeror's Past Performance proposal volume and information obtained from other sources available to the Government, to include, but not limited to, the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), or other databases; interviews with Program Managers and Contracting Officers; the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA), and commercial sources.

(i) Recency Assessment

An assessment of the past performance information will be made to determine if it is recent. To be recent, the effort must be ongoing or must have been performed during the past six (6) years from the issuance month of this solicitation. Past performance information that fails this condition will not be evaluated.

(ii) Relevancy Assessment

The Government will conduct an in-depth evaluation of all recent performance information obtained to determine how closely the products provided/services performed under those contracts relate to the Technical subfactors and Cost/Price factor, including their relative order of importance (reference 1.1a). Consideration will be given to projects involving the type of construction and work elements described in the attached Specifications. Relevant past performance information must demonstrate design and construction experience with facilities of equal or greater size as this project (2,270 square feet). Past performance must also demonstrate experience with ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC), electrical, mechanical, and other major trades required by this project. A relevancy determination of the offeror's past performance will be made based upon the aforementioned considerations, including joint venture partner(s). In determining relevancy for individual contracts, consideration will be given to the effort, or portion of the effort, being proposed by the offeror or teaming partner whose contract is being reviewed and evaluated. The past performance information forms (PIFs) and information obtained from other sources will be used to establish the degree of relevancy of past performance. The Government will use the following relevancy definitions when assessing recent contracts:

Rating	Definition
VERY RELEVANT	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
RELEVANT	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
SOMEWHAT RELEVANT	Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
NOT RELEVANT	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

(2) Assigning Ratings. As a result of the relevancy of the recent contracts evaluated, offerors will receive an integrated performance confidence assessment rating. Although the past performance evaluation focuses on performance that is relevant to the Technical subfactors and cost/price factor, the resulting performance confidence assessment rating is made at the factor level and represents an overall evaluation of contractor performance. Offerors without a record of recent/relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned will not be

evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance and, as a result, will receive an "Unknown Confidence" rating for the Past Performance factor.

More recent performance will have a greater impact on the Performance Confidence Assessment than less recent or relevant effort. A strong record of relevant past performance may be considered more advantageous to the Government than an "Unknown Confidence" rating. Likewise, a more relevant past performance record may receive a higher confidence rating and be considered more favorably than a less relevant record of favorable performance.

(3) If team agreement is submitted as part of the proposal as outlined in Section L para 3.1.8, each teaming offeror's past performance will be evaluated separately using the same evaluation methods described above. The Prime Contractor's past performance will be weighted slightly more than equal based on their overall responsibility for contract management. The separate ratings of each party in the Teaming Agreement will be combined to determine an aggregate PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE RATING as defined in paragraph 1.1.c.

d. Cost or Price Factor

The offeror's Cost/Price proposal will be evaluated to ensure it is reasonable and realistic, pursuant to [FAR 15.404](#). For additional information see [FAR 31.201-3](#).

(1) Reasonable – Must represent a price to the Government that a prudent person would pay in the conduct of competitive business.

(2) Realistic – Evaluation of the extent to which proposed costs are sufficient for the work to be performed, reflective of a clear understanding of the requirements, and consistent with the unique methods of performance and materials described in the offeror's technical proposal.

(3) Unrealistically low proposed costs/prices may be grounds for eliminating a proposal from competition either on the basis that the offeror does not understand the requirement or the offeror has made an unrealistic proposal.

(4) Unbalanced Pricing: The Government will analyze proposals to determine whether they are unbalanced with respect to prices, variable quantity matrix factors, and separately priced line items in accordance with FAR 15.404-1. An offer may be rejected if the contracting officer determines that the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

e. Clarifications, Discussions, and Negotiations.

The Government intends to evaluate offers and award a contract without discussions with offerors. Therefore, the offerors initial offer should contain the offeror's best terms from a price and technical standpoint. In accordance with FAR 15.306, Offerors may be asked to clarify certain aspects of their proposal (for example, relevance of past performance information). Communications (Clarifications) conducted to resolve minor or clerical errors will not constitute discussions and the contracting officer reserves the right to award a contract without the opportunity for proposal revision. However, the Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if later determined by the Contracting Officer to be necessary. Discussions or negotiations may be conducted with all offerors in the competitive range. Offerors may be

required to participate in telephone discussions or in face-to-face oral discussions at the 1st Special Operations Contracting Squadron, 350 Tully Street, Hurlburt Field, FL, 32544.

f. Contractor Responsibility.

Once the apparent successful offeror is selected the Government will evaluate the offeror's financial capabilities and the specified criteria at FAR 9.104. In the case of a Teaming Agreement, the financial capabilities of both teaming partners will be evaluated, with the Prime Contractor's financial capability carrying significantly more weight than the subcontractor's. Attachment 5, Financial Reference Worksheet will be forwarded to the financial institution and a determination will be made regarding the apparent successful offerors financial capabilities and overall contractor responsibility using the specified criteria at FAR 9.104.

1.2 SOLICITATION REQUIREMENTS, TERMS AND CONDITIONS

Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as factors or subfactors. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the solicitation may result in the offeror being ineligible for award. Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and must provide complete supporting rationale.

(End of Summary of Changes)